DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 977 TM 004 095

TITLE Process Evaluation in the Behavior Oriented Prescriptive Teaching Approach.

PUB DATE Oct 73

NOTE 49p.; Presented in Symposium at the Annual Meeting of the Mid South Education Research Association (2nd, November 1973). Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of the appendices

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; Computer Programs; Educational Accountability; Effective Teaching; *Elementary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Family Programs; Feedback; *Formative Evaluation; *Home Instruction; Learning Activities; Observation; Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; Self Evaluation; *Student Teacher Relationship; Summative Evaluation; Teacher Evaluation

IDENTIFIERS *Behavior Oriented Prescriptive Teaching Approach

ABSTRACT

This symposium focuses on the development and uses of a comprehensive evaluation system within a long-term research and development project in primary education. Issues and problems associated with this development over the past four years are discussed. These issues and problems include: (1) eudcational accountability; (2) parent participation, (3) instrument development, (4) psychological and sociological concerns of those evaluated, (5) computer uses and feedback lag, (6) relationship of evaluation to the objectives of the program, and (7) uses of both process and product evaluation data in program improvement. The process of developing a responsive evaluation system to be discussed provides a comprehensive case history of a pragmatic effort to use scientific procedures in the improvement of educational opportunities for young children. The program used to demonstrate this development process is one of 22 Follow Through programs. The particular program is called "The Parent Supported Application of the Behavior Oriented Prescriptive Teaching Approach." (Author)

ED 100977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARENT SUPPORTED FOLLOW THROUGH

an application of the

BEHAVIOR ORIENTED PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING APPROACH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCESS EVALUATION

in the

BEHAVIOR ORIENTED PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING APPROACH

October 1973

TM 004 095

Presented in Symposium
at the
Second Annual Meeting of the
Mid South Education Research Association

November 15, 1973

Organizer: John H. Neel
Project Director: Walter L. Hodges
Contributors: Harry F. Carter
W. Roby Egan
Ellen J. Gruber
Alberta Harrison
Discussants: Dorlan Mork
Rosestelle Wolner
Chairperson: Virginia D. Horns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Page

Definition of Sponsor's Approach 1
Walter L. Hodges

The Process of Developing a Responsive Evaluation System . 10
John H. Neel

Evaluation by Objectives 16
Harry F. Carter

Home Instruction 22
W. Robie Egan

Classroom Instruction. 28
Ellen J. Gruber

Appendix A. Home Instruction Instrument
Sample Data

Appendix B. Classroom Instrument
Sample Data

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEFINITION OF SPONSOR S APPROACH

AN OVERVIEW OF THE PARENT SUPPORTED APPLICATION OF BEHAVIOR ORIENTED PERSCRIPTIVE TEACHING APPROACH

Parent Supported Follow Through is a diagnostic program which focuses on the interactions of parent with child and teachers with children. It is based on the belief that all parents are capable of and have the desire to increase their own skills for improving their child's learning. Likewise, teachers, when given adequate support and opportunities, can provide more effective learning situations for the children in their classrooms. The schools, parents, and community can provide more successful learning and developmental opportunities cooperatively than any one group can alone. It is imperative, therefore, that parents and other teachers, develop more effective child-helping skills as well as the means to use these skills systematically. The Parent Supported process provides for improvement in the child-helping skills of parents, para-professionals, and professional participants through the Home Instruction, Classroom Instruction, and Family Services Components.

The entire process of program development is created from a view of learning and teaching called the Behavior Oriented Prescriptive Teaching Approach. The word "behavior" indicates that the program tries to make the process and objectives concrete and specific so that all persons involved can see children progress.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Oriented" means that there is a positive attitude toward improvement through self-evaluation to be learned by all participants. "Prescriptive" means that each succeeding learning activity is chosen by using day-by-day assessments of what each child can and cannot do. "Teaching" is what happens when one human helps another get those experiences needed for learning and development. "Approach" implies that the learning system is open to change and improvement as more is learned about children through careful implementation and evaluation.

BOPTA is process-oriented with respect to staff. The program embodies a process of shared responsibility because the community staff, with the support of the Sponsor, creates those learning activities which children need. Involvement in the BOPTA process is thereby improved because the learning activities are created by those directly responsible for helping children learn - parents and teachers. Children work with these activities both at home and at school.

BOPTA is process-oriented with respect to children. The learning activities are focused on the "how-to" of learning rather than directly on the content. For example, role playing instead of "community helpers", classification skills rather than "science", and self-evaluation rather than teacher-given grades are examples of objectives sought.

The program is diagnostic and prescriptive in two ways. First, the skills of parents and children are assessed and units

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and levels of learning activities are provided to meet their needs. Parents are involved in this diagnostic process along with home visitors and teachers. Second, each child is observed by his parents or teachers as he works through the BOPTA units. In this way most, if not all, of the sensory, intellectual, and attitudinal strengths and weaknesses of children become known.

A core program of learning-to-learn ideas, skills, and attitudes which every child must master during the preschool and primary years is provided through the Approach. These learning-to-learn processes are required in learning to read, write, solve problems, do science, use language, or study social phenomena. Children who do not develop these processes when they are young are hampered in future learning. The BOPTA objectives are written in such a way that parents and others can see clearly what the child is supposed to be able to do. It is, therefore, easier to plan activities and capitalize on situations which will help children learn. These objectives are listed in Skill Objectives for Children: An Early Learning Program and include four different types of skills:

(1) Intrapersonal skills (e.g., development of a positive self concept, using others as sources of information, helping others),

(2) Interpersonal skills (e.g., getting along with other children and with adults, impulse control, delay of gratification),

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(3) Thinking and reasoning skills (e.g., language, classification, problem solving, number concepts),

(4) Sensory-perceptual-motor skills (e.g., eye-hand coordination, tactile sensitivity, auditory discrimination, muscle and balance development).

The program builds upon a community's existing reading, writing, and arithmetic curriculum in these ways. First, it supplements and supports the school curriculum by helping parents teach the basic learning skills at home. Second, the community and sponsor modify or replace the existing in-school curriculum by applying the BOPTA learning and teaching principles to the present program. Third it provides an alternative curriculum at home when the child is not performing well elsewhere.

The Approach calls attention to and trains staff in fundamental instructional skills, attitudes, and concepts. Parents and other teachers must apply these techniques systematically in order to help children learn effectively. These techniques are identified in the BOPTA Classroom Instruction Manual. They include the ability to: (1) assess the child as he learns, (2) create positive child-adult interactions, (3) provide success experiences, (4) give the child immediate knowledge of how he is doing, (5) set a clear example of how a task can be done, (6) involve children in learning and (7) diagnose and follow-up when the child has difficulties.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The program combines those things we now know about children, learning, teaching, teachers, and parents in a useable form. The objectives for children, the child's previous performance, and instructional skills are all used in creating learning activities. Learning activities for each child are planned for with relation to each objective. Activities are tried and evaluated. If the child learns, the program continues. If the child does not learn, a new plan is tried and evaluated.

The Self-Evaluation process contains provisions for the identification of needs for program modification. Assessment of the progress of each child as well as evaluation of the performance of each staff member can lead to the continual development and renewal of the program. The attitude that assessment and evaluation can be used to help people grow and to identify their needs is an essential part of staff development in the BOPTA program. All personnel, local as well as sponsor, are involved in the Self-Evaluation program (Self-Evaluation Manual) usually both as evaluator and evaluated. The results of these evaluations are used to pinpoint the needs for further work with children, for creating new learning experiences for parents, teachers, teaching assistants, or others, and for revising the system itself.

The program is carried out through three components: Home Instruction, Classroom Instruction, and Family Services. The Home and Classroom Instruction Components support one another, but each is an independent and parallel instructional system

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which can stand alone. The Home Instruction Component provides parents instructional skills necessary for systematic, positive, and meaningful learning activities with their children. Parents are employed as Home Visitors. These Home Visitors teach other parents about the instructional process (see the Home Instruction Manual).

The Classroom Instruction Component helps teachers and teaching assistants (also parents) implement a diagnostic learning system using individual and small group formats (see the Classroom Instruction Manual). The classroom system combines both direct instruction independent learning, and discovery methods depending upon the objectives being sought.

The third component, Family Services, is designed to focus the resources of the community on to development of effective programs of prevention and remediation in the areas of medical, dental, nutritional, sociological and psychological needs. Medical, dental, and psychological screening, diagnosis and remedial services are coordinated. The Family Services Component follows up on diagnosed needs discovered through the Home and Classroom Instruction Components as well as through its own routine screening program. Parent education is provided based on the needs of the families involved. Family Services organizes the parent and community volunteer program to help in the Classroom and Home Instruction Components. The Family Services Component may include a school social worker, school psychologist, medical

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

specialist, parent educator and para-professional assistants or one or another of these roles may be combined.

Both the Home and Classroom Instruction Components provide activities designed to help each child master the learning-to-learn objectives chosen from the Skill Objectives for Children Manual. Units for Classroom Instruction are written by Home Visitors for the tutorial parent-child situation. These tutorial units are focused on the same objective as the small group units but these use different activities. All units are written in a fame format where ever it is useful and practical. Within each unit there is a definite order and many units follow others in a natural sequence. The order of units for any particular child, however, depends on the child's needs. For each objective the sponsor and community build activities on several levels of difficulty so that each child can be given the correct unit.

Pretests of each child's level of achievement on the learning skills help determine where the child begins. Units are selected for both home and school based on the pretest, as well as parent, teacher, and home visitor observations. Posttests are given to the child when he completes a unit. His performance on the unit posttest is used to determine the next unit and level of difficulty.

In addition to the basic learning units there are optional learning kits to be used when children are unable to cope with

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

specific units or who have a special need in a particular area of development. Individually designed materials and activities are also provided for children for whom no other available activities are appropriate. The processes of developing the basic units and the optional learning kits are described in The Learning Activities Manual.

The Sponsor provides (1) staff training in the form of preservice and inservice workshops, observations, feedback sessions, and training materials; (2) program support materials in the form of a Classroom Instruction Manual, Home Instruction Manual, Learning Activities Manual, Self-Evaluation Manual, Skill Objectives Manual, and a Family Services Manual; (3) curriculum materials in the form of Pretests, Unit Posttests, Starter Learning Activities, and Optional Learning Kits; and (4) monthly feedback summaries based on the Self-Evaluation program data.

The BOPTA research program provides information concerning the overall effectiveness of the Parent Supported Follow Through Program within each community. This information can be used to determine the relative value of this systematic approach in comparison with other efforts in helping children gain those skills so necessary in today's world.

In summary, the Parent Supported Application of the Behavior Oriented Prescriptive Teaching Approach is a cooperative relationship between a community and a university department of Early Education. The goal is to focus the skills and talents of every

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

facet of a community on the early educational, social, and physical development of its primary school age children. The methods are based on shared responsibility and accountability with respect to the adults involved and on the individualized development of the processes of learning with respect to the children involved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Process of Developing a Responsive Evaluation System

Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus (Page 8, 1971) define evaluation as "... the systematic collection of evidence to determine whether in fact certain changes are taking place in the learners as well as to determine the amount or degree of change in individual learners." They go on to distinguish two types of evaluation; formative and summative (after Scriven, 1967).

Formative evaluation is evidence gathered during the construction and trial of new curriculum (Bloom et al Page 117, 1971). Summative evaluation is evidence gathered after the curriculum has been applied. (Bloom, Page 61-65, 1971). Formative evaluation is much like a course check during a voyage while summative evaluation is an appraisal of the quality of the Voyage.

Stufflebeam (1967) has added a third type of evaluation to the two originally defined by Scriven. This third type is process evaluation. When formative evaluation has guided a curriculum which summative evaluation shows satisfactory the next step is to implement that curriculum. If the curriculum is well defined in terms of materials, methods and activities it is only necessary to follow those definitions in order to implement the curriculum. Evidence gathered which demonstrates the extent to which the intended curriculum is being implemented is termed process evaluation.

A distinct feature of process evaluation is that it focuses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

on the student only to the extent that the student is necessary to examination of the curriculum. The major focus is on materials, methods, and activities. Naturally when learning activities are examined students will be present but process evaluation will focus on the activity and the extent to which the activity is implemented as the curriculum indicates it should be. Success of the learner in the activity is presumed from the previous formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation has helped construct the curriculum, summative evaluation has certified it as useful and process evaluation is then used to ensure current implementation.

The concern in this symposium is with process evaluation. The model and curriculum for BOPTA is presumed sound and the question is whether the model curriculum is being implemented as planned. The question of implementation was a concern of the model sponsor in 1970 and the following years have had implementation as a primary concern.

Significant Factors in the Model

Two components of the BOPTA Model have been identified through the personnel responsible for their implementation, the teacher and the home visitor. Focusing on teacher and home visitor effectively dichotomizes the curriculum into school and home components.

It might be argued that the parents are the ones who will implement the curriculum in the home and this is true as far as the child is concerned. However, it should be remembered that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the curriculum has goals for the entire family as well as for the child. Moreover, the parents are not responsible to the sponsor as the home visitor is and the sponsor only has control of the curriculum up to the point of the home visitor. The home visitor and teacher can modify the curriculum and are appropriate focuses for process evaluation.

Similar components are used by the home visitor and classroom teacher. Each is responsible for the presence of materials the use of these materials, a method of instruction, and rapport with the learner. In 1972-1973 components vital to the curriculum were identified by those who developed the curriculum.

These components were then incorporated in a rating scale for home visitors and similar but separate scale for teachers. On site supervisors were trained to use the scale and to use it to rate teachers and home visitors. These scales involved judgements on the part of the observer of the goodness of certain observed behaviors. Naturally this led to reliability and validity questions which were difficult to answer and would have required extensive training of the observers.

These difficulties led to the current form of the two observation instruments. Use of observer judgement was given up in favor of a checklist of observable behaviors and conditions which paralleled those on the former scale.. The advantage to this is the removal of a considerable amount of judgement in the observations. Thus on the former scale an observer was required

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to rate the effectiveness of a learning center. On the current version the observer only notes 1) the presence of the learning center, 2) whether it is stocked, and 3) whether it is used. Judgement of the effectiveness of the learning center has been avoided, yet the three items certainly include a portion of the information to be used in that judgement and when coupled with other items in the checklist include a large portion of the information which makes the basis for the judgement. The checklists are easily interpretable in terms of percentages of desirable behavior and conditions exhibited. This is an important feature when working with home visitors who are not familiar with scales. The checklist provides good basis for discussion between home visitors and supervisors and between teachers and supervisors. The checklist does not contain direct judgements of home visitors and teachers but instead records types of behaviors and classroom conditions. This provides a non threatening basis for discussion which supervisors, home visitors and teachers should find easy to operate in.

Validation and Reliability

Validation of these instruments is a matter of content validation and thus of judgement. Those who developed the instruments were the same people who developed the curriculum and validity is assumed only to the extent that their judgements were correct. Reliability has not been established for these instruments. It is hoped that the checklists are clear and will

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

yield reliable data. Since the activities in the same classroom will differ as the term progresses it will be very difficult to establish realiability on the sites. It will probably be necessary to establish realiability by using video tapes so that the same situation may be observed by different observers and at different times.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T., and Madaus, G. F. Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning, McGraw-Hill: New York, 1971.

Scriven, M. The Methodology of Evaluation AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, 1967, No. 1.

Stufflebeam, D. L. "The Use and Abuse of Evaluation in Title III address delivered at the National Seminar on Innovation, Sponsored by Kettering Foundation and U. S. Office of Education, Honolulu, July 1967.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation by Objectives: Instrument Development

The development of the Behavior Oriented Prescriptive Teaching Approach's (BOPTA) self evaluation plan has occurred over a three year period and is still undergoing modification. A critical concept in the development of the plan is a system of "shared responsibility" between the Model Sponsor and the local site. At all levels of the program there has been a concerted effort to plan with the local system to develop forms, instruments and systems to carry out the process evaluation plan.

Toward the end of the first two years of the program, the Model Sponsor became concerned that the program was not being successfully implemented and that there was no way to determine what the specific problems were. There were general feelings of concern expressed by both local and sponsor personnel. In preparation for the new 1971-1972 proposal, much attention was devoted to developing a thorough process evaluation system. The first step was to reassess the program and base the implementation on a set of realistic objectives for all elements of the program. From these objectives there was developed a job description for each role within the program. To insure that the job descriptions were accurate, projections of the work load for each role position was a major part of planning and training.

Once the objectives, job descriptions and general plan of implementation were clear the next step was to develop a way to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assess the implementation on a frequent basis.

The operation of the program was divided into three areas, Classroom Instruction, Home Instruction and Family Services. These components were managed by coordinators who were primarily responsible for the implementation and evaluation of their component.

Working together the Sponsor and local personnel developed a set of assessment tools for each of the above components. The software was developed to be used three ways; first, as individual record keeping or daily logs, second, as observation instruments and third, as summary report forms. There were also miscellaneous referral forms and others necessary for record keeping.

There were two policy decisions made that were to be critical for the success for the evaluation system. First, in all cases of observation of individuals there was to be immediate feedback to the person observed so that he/she would have a chance to respond to the observation and make their own interpretation or self evaluation a part of the report. Second, Observations would be made on a regular pre-planned basis by all staff in the program this would include both local and sponsor directors. This would mean that the people most responsible for the success of the program (the director) would see the program in operation at all levels.

For the 1971-1972 year twenty different items of software were developed and local personnel trained in their use. Logs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and summaries usually reflected the specifics of the individuals job description. For example, the Home Visitor Log was a form used by the Home Visitor to record her interaction with each family. She recorded the number of visit, activities brought into the home, the amount of time she spent at a home, and a general rating of each family's level of cooperation and consistency. This log was a personal record of what the Home Visitor was doing on the job and aided her in the self evaluation of her interactions with each family. The information on the log was easily transferred then to the Home Visitor Summary and each month this summary was given to the local coordinator who in turn submitted a copy to the Sponsor and a report to the local director. The local director and sponsor would then determine if parents were being visited often enough, if learning activities were being taken to the home and/or if the Home Visitors were having any difficulties with their families. This record coupled with the use of the observation form led easily to planning for in-service training.

Observation Instruments were based on the theoretical model, For example, the Model specifies in a set of teacher strategies three general headings; planning, interacting and follow-up. The first teacher observation instrument developed for local use was broken down in the same three areas. A more specific example would be as follows: In the Planning Phase of the theoretical model there is a critical strategy that tells teachers the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

following: Achieving the proper match between current objectives, previous learned skills and each child's learning mode is important to providing the best instruction. In training, each teacher develops the use of this strategy and it should be evident in her planning for daily instruction with children. The observer is asked to determine if such is the case in a pre-observation interview. A close look at the teacher observation instrument will show the reader a close parallel with the complete set of teacher strategies.

Many changes were made during the first year (1971-1972) and by the beginning of the 1972-1973 school year there were over forty (40) pieces of software developed, not all of these were used all the time but they were used at regular intervals. One major change for the 1972-1973 year was to obtain machine processing for basic data collection on the child and the family who are the main objectives of the Follow Through Program. Another major change for the 1972-1973 school year was to make the basic observation instruments more objective, and finally there were many changes made in the individual record keeping forms. This was done to make the burdensome and lengthy chore of record keeping an efficient and worthwhile task.

The use of Optical Scanning Forms was determined to be the most effective way to regularly collect child and family data and to provide accurate feedback to local site personnel. An entire year was needed to operationalize the system. There were

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

many problems, the most important problems being the difficulty of training para-professionals in the proper use of Optical Scanning Forms and inadequacies of the original form itself. As each new error appeared either in the form or in the use of it, the program had to be modified and all data re-processed. During the year we were unable to utilize the OPSCAN data except to evaluate the system itself. This proved valuable and led to improvements which resulted in an operational program for the 1973-1974 year. A quality control system was instituted to insure that the problems of execution of the system at all levels that occurred during the first year would not be repeated during the second year. The Optical Scanning System now provides us with monthly summaries of the individual progress of the children and families. In addition, the same data are summarized by site, Teacher's and Home Visitor's. This provides data about what is happening in the program and who is doing it.

The continuing modification of the basic observation instrument for home and classroom instruction has led to machine processing also. To accomplish this it was necessary to make the items on the form as objective as possible and to make them uni-dimensional. Uni-dimensional means to make sure that each item on the form had only one distinguishable variable as it's objective. As long as we were providing feedback to the sites through individual monthly summaries it was not necessary to utilize computer assistance. However, as we began to combine

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

monthly reports, the numbers involved made it more efficient to mechanize the process. The system now produces an analysis for each Teacher and Home Visitor, showing that person's progress on each item on the form. These data are updated each month by utilizing a floating mean. There is also an analysis of each separate item that covers the responses for all Teachers and Home Visitors for their respective forms.

The results of these analyses provide pertinent information about the relative status of each person as they relate to the objectives of their role, and information about the objectives themselves across all participants. Therefore, it becomes easy to determine which objectives are creating difficulties, or are not being met, and exactly which people are having difficulties. This simplifies the process of planning for in-service training.

The difficulty with process assessment has been and still is convincing the personnel in the program of the necessity of it and overcoming past fears of the term "evaluation".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Home Instruction: Improvement Through Evaluation

The inclusion of a home instruction component in the BOPTA Follow Through Model, as in most Follow Through models, is based on the fact that learning can occur any place at any time and on the belief that all parents are capable of and have the desire to increase their own skills for improving their child's learning.

The Home Instruction Component of BOPTA contains two general objectives. One set of general objectives is based on those principles which deal with developing a positive self-concept in parents, improving the quality of parent child relationships, and reinforcing those attitudes and beliefs held by Home Visitors about people which will enable them to use constructive and effective techniques when working with parents. The other set of general objectives is related to practical tasks such as helping parents learn effective methods of teaching basic skills to their children, motivating parents to teach the learning activities and alternatives for responding to children in a learning situation. In short the basic objectives are to help parents develop the idea that they are good parents and effective teachers of their children. To accomplish this the Home Instruction Component provides parents instructional skills necessary for systematic, positive, and meaningful learning activities with their children.

Home Visitors are the main instruments for implementing the Home Instruction Component. It is essentially through the Home

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Visitors, themselves usually parents of Follow Through children, that the above objectives must be accomplished. Resources available to the Home Visitors include supervisory conferences (there is one Home Instruction Coordinator and two Home Instruction Assistants at each site), self evaluation forms, referral system, learning activities workshops, and regular in-service training provided by the local staff and Georgia State University consultants.

The process of developing learning activities consists of three phases. The Sponsor selects the general objectives for the basic curriculum and writes the starter learning activities. The Sponsor then presents the starter learner activities to the local staff and Home Visitors and assists in training Home Visitors to write Follow Up Learning Activities, the actual writing of these activities to be done by the Home Visitors. These activities are reviewed on site by the supervisory staff and then sent to the Sponsor for review and evaluation. Sponsor review and evaluation, return of the activities to the site, revision and correction by the Home Visitors who wrote the activities, and the reproduction and distribution of the learning activities comprise the final phase.

On the individual level each Home Visitor is involved in planning, interacting and following up on her work with parents. The planning phase begins with planning the initial contact with parents, scheduling home visits with each parent, observing each child in the classroom, and conferring with the teacher on the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

needs of each child. The interacting phase begins with establishing a working relationship with each parent, moves through the whole process of presenting learning activities, and ends when the child is tested on the objectives taught by the parent.

The Home Visitor's interaction with parents and observations of children will be a guide in planning the content of follow-up Learning Activities. The Home Instruction Coordinator, Home Instruction Assistants, and Sponsor representatives serve as resource people for Home Visitors in Learning Activities Workshops.

The success of the Home Instruction Component of the program obviously depends largely on what transpires during the actual visit so a discussion of the objectives of the visit are in order. Establishing rapport with the parents is the first objective. The Home Visitor must first listen and, as experience is gained in making home visits, the Home Visitor should be able to determine a parent's attitude and current level of functioning during the first five to ten minutes of each visit. If the parent has completed a Unit of work and is ready for a new set of learning activities the Home Visitor should be ready to present the new unit and materials. The Home Visitor is expected to do anything necessary to help the parent understand the objective of the unit and the procedures in each activity. The Home Visitor will be able to explain the background and reasons for the learning activities.

The Home Visitor should visit each family once a week and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

someone accompanies the Home Visitor once a month to directly observe work with a parent. The observations are made by the Home Instruction Coordinator, Home Instruction Assistants, the Director, a Principal, or a member of the Sponsor's Staff. The observer looks at the procedures, content, and quality of the interaction between Home Visitor and parent and these factors are evaluated during the visit on the Home Visitor Observation Checklist. This is the most important of the formative evaluation instruments used in the Home Instruction Component. The observer discusses the checklist immediately after the visit with the Home Visitor. Reports of these observations provide in-put concerning the training needs of the local site. Many of the individual needs can be taken care of at the scene. The coordinator may immediately provide assistance or retraining when the need arises. When an observation is completed it may not be part of the report until it has been fully discussed with the person observed, guaranteeing immediate feedback. The data are then sent to the Sponsor who makes monthly summaries for the sites. These summaries point out the broader needs, e.g., Home Visitors may not be explaining well the rationale of the learning activities to parents. The local site should immediately respond to correct any problems or weaknesses. If not, the Sponsor will work with the local staff to design appropriate in-service training.

As mentioned, the Home Visitor Observation Checklist is the most crucial self-evaluation instrument for the Home Instruction

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Component of the program. Other necessary data are generated daily by personnel in the program and recorded through the Self-Evaluation System. The Home Visitor Log, used to record each contact between a Home Visitor and a family, is used to compile the Family Monthly Report. The latter includes such information on families as number of home visits made in each home, the number of learning activities taken into each home, the number of learning activities completed, the average rating on cooperation and consistency and the amount of time the parents volunteered in the classroom. The Home Instruction Coordinator Summary provides the local director and the sponsor with a summary of the activities of the Home Instruction Component at the end of each month. Particular attention is given to recording the type of in-service training provided and any difficulties or assistance that the Home Instruction Coordinator needs. The Child Progress Report provides the following data: where each child is in the curriculum, the score of each child on each unit of instruction, and identification of units that are not effective. These data are used to identify the training needs of the local staff as well as progress of children and the effect of implementation procedures on this component.

When the Sponsor receives data from the local project it is immediately screened for obvious problems or needs and feedback is provided by phone to the local site. Later a careful analysis of the monthly data is made and written reports are sent back

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to each local coordinator. The local Director is sent a summary of the data as analyzed by the sponsor and a copy of the reports that have been sent back to each coordinator.

The variables monitored through the Self Evaluation System are generally derived from the job descriptions of personnel in the program or from the objectives for various components and persons. Every person in the program is involved in collecting data for self evaluation and is in some way a subject of the evaluation. It is the sponsor's intention to create a positive attitude toward the concept of evaluation. An attempt at accomplishing this is made by assessing personnel on the basis of specific, fair job descriptions and providing fast effective retraining procedures so that people in the program can see positive helpful results from the evaluation efforts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Classroom Instruction: Improvement through Evaluation

Essentially the task of the Follow Through Research Component is to measure in as much detail as practical the effects of the local projects. The evaluation design is divided into the following two general areas: first, process, or self evaluation data and second, product, or summative data.

The process or self evaluation of this program is designed to identify the immediate retraining and procedural needs of the program. Basic objectives of this area of evaluation are as follows:

(1) To provide accurate and timely feedback on the performance level of individuals within the program.

(2) To provide a sound basis for determining retraining and recycling needs of individuals within the program.

(3) To provide data that will indicate appropriate interim modification in procedures and curriculum development.

Evaluation in education has been anathema to educators for several reasons. Gottman and Clasen (1972) in Evaluation and Education, list several reasons for this: 1) the product of the school has never been defined sufficiently well to permit anyone either to describe the production process or to determine the extent to which the schools are successful, 2) the entire educational system lives in an informational vacuum: some data which are generated are unused because they are irrelevant, other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

data receive no response by educators because they are not considered data, 3) the term, "Evaluation", is threatening, as it connotes the mysticism of statistics, value judgements being placed upon a teacher's job performance and hours of hard work to a teacher who is already overburdened.

Gottman and Clasen (1972) suggest in Evaluation and Education that, "The role of the teacher is fast becoming one of a facilitator of learning. It is crucial for teachers and administrators to develop the skills needed to monitor the progress of individual students in attaining educational objectives. Contrary to public belief, only a few skills, not an infinite number, are required for building feedback loops in educational Programs."

The Follow Through BOPTA Model makes the assumption that evaluation is an extremely important educational tool which, when used effectively, can improve classroom instruction and teacher attitudes. This Model is based on the teacher strategies of planning, interaction, and following up. The Planning Phase includes four interrelated instructional behaviors: selecting objectives, analyzing children's learning status, analyzing tasks, and matching tasks to the child's learning status.

The Interaction Phase refers to those occasions when the teacher is in direct contact or is involved with a child or a group of children. The quality of this interaction determines, to a large extent, the effectiveness with which children learn. The quality of interaction is determined by the personality of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the adult, the degree to which the learning activities planned are appropriate, and the instructional skills that the adult has learned to apply in interaction with children.

In general, the tasks of the instructor are to make sure that: 1) incentives are available to the child so that he orients and attends to the task, 2) there is a structure in which the child can operate on the learning materials, 3) there is a way to elicit verbal or motoric responses so that the child can receive feedback and finally, 4) there is a way the child can receive information on the appropriateness of his/her response. Most adults can improve their skills in these four areas.

The Follow Up Phase includes assessing learning progress, providing for new learning episodes and providing for recall, association, transfer, or generalization.

The Classroom Instruction Component of the Follow Through Project is based on the need to develop a more individualized and diagnostic approach to children's learning. There is also the need to develop a series of instructional strategies that will result in a school environment that is more appropriate to the individual needs of children. This approach responds to the needs of the teacher for a more explicit approach to helping children develop learning skills rather than emphasizing content alone.

To accomplish the above stated objectives of the Follow Through Program, a great amount of information from the field is necessary.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In 1971, the Sponsor initiated a self evaluation program in order to design and analyze more formal instruments to assist in the task of assessment of site teachers and supervisors. It was hoped that it would be possible to involve as many persons as possible at all levels in the evaluation of the program. The necessary data are generated daily by personnel in the program and recorded through the Self Evaluation System. A number of instruments and forms are used to record the classroom component data. These devices include the following for the classroom: 1) daily logs in which people record what happens during each day of their job, 2) summaries from the above logs used to report data on a periodic basis, 3) observation forms for teachers and teaching assistants, 4) Rating Scales to be used in assessing the progress of teachers and teaching assistants in developing their classrooms, 5) a Child Progress Report which records the progress of each child on each objective he/she attempts (machine processed forms for quick feedback), 6) a set of forms used by teachers to evaluate the learning activities, 7) monthly reports from each coordinator used to summarize the efforts of each component, 8) Monthly Reports from teachers and teaching assistants, that provide a way for these persons to indicate needs.

The variables monitored through this system are generally derived from the job descriptions of personnel in the program or from objectives for various components and persons. The implementation of the classroom component is based on the efforts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of personnel in the following key roles: 1) Classroom Instruction Coordinator, 2) Classroom Teacher, and 3) the Teaching Assistant.

The various instruments which have been used by these individuals to measure the effectiveness of the classroom component have undergone revision throughout the years.

First, many forms were used primarily as checklists although the instruments were not in that format. Secondly, as a result of many teachers and supervisors embracing ambivalent attitudes toward "Evaluation", most completed forms were returned to the Sponsor with extremely positive evaluations. Discrepancies arose when the Sponsor's representatives visited the site and found conditions opposite from those indicated by the forms, prevailing. In general, teachers and supervisors were both uncomfortable.

The Sponsor now assumed a more active role in the process of evaluation, believing that changes in attitudes were of prime concern. Sponsor representatives now modeled behavior. Informal discussions were held, with the sponsor and supervisor and/or teachers taking active roles in discussing problems and ways to change attitudes. The sponsor initiated these informal training sessions primarily to change and improve attitudes toward evaluation.

In 1972, the sponsors and site staff jointly decided to transform the BOPTA Teacher Observation form into a checklist since that was the way it was being used by teachers and supervisors. It was further decided that individual rating forms in each area would be used.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

After implementing this new approach, problems now arose. The rating forms were found to be unsuccessful for the following reasons:

(a) the forms were too numerous

(b) the forms did not give quick feedback on the status in the classroom. An effective process system depends on quick feedback.

(c) the forms were not based upon observed behavior.

(d) the forms were too subjective.

After analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation instruments up to this point, it was decided that the following criteria would guide new efforts in the construction of a new teacher observation instrument:

(1) One form, rather than many forms was preferred.

(2) A form that could be completed and scored quickly was desired.

(3) The form should be less subjective than the previous observation form used by the sponsor. Emphasis should now be upon instruments which could easily measure observed behavior. "Yes" or "No" answers should be used.

(4) Focus upon learning centers should be incorporated into the new instrument.

The Teacher Observation Instrument Form 070, which will be used in 1973-1974 was designed to meet the aforementioned criteria. The instrument is composed of three sections: 1) Room features, which stresses learning centers and child initiated activities,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2) transition, 3) Learning Activity - Teacher Behavior.

This instrument was developed because it was felt that the most important task of the supervisory person is to be able to help those persons for which the supervisor is responsible. This assistance cannot come until the supervisor does the following.

(1) The supervisor must assess the strength and weaknesses of the teacher.

(2) The supervisor must be able to communicate frankly with the teacher about those strengths and weaknesses.

It is important to remember that a weakness that appears in a particular area does not indicate necessarily that the overall performance of an individual is poor. Weakness, as is indicated on the Teacher Observation Instrument - Form 070 indicates that there is an area of concern that needs to be corrected, modified, or explained.

When using the Teacher Observation Instrument - Form 070 the teacher should be observed by a supervisory person (classroom coordinator) at least once each month.

The observer should be in place before the learning activity is to begin. There are two reasons for arriving early:

(1) The first section of the Observation Instrument is a recording of the physical appearnace of the classroom. Some time must be given to completing that part of the instrument (five-ten minutes).

(2) Observing how the teacher moves from the current activities

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

into the activity to be observed is an important part of the observation, and refers to the second phase.

Data from the Follow Through forms will be used to assess the in-service training needs of participants in the clasrroom component of the program. Feedback to each site of collective data will be communicated on a regular monthly basis. This feedback will take the form of written summaries and verbal discussion with appropriate local staff.

APENDIX I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Home Visitor Observation Checklist

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Observer_____

Parent_____ H.V. Number_____

Home Visitor_____

Date_____

YES	NO	Not Applicable	CONTENT	COMMENTS
			Section 1. Planning	
			1. Was it apparent that the parent was expecting the Home Visitor?	
			2. Was the Home Visitor on time?	
			3. Did the Home Visitor come prepared with the following items or information: a. information on child progress in the classroom b. information on child progress on unit tests c. materials and learning activities	
			Section 2. Presenting Learning Activities	
			If the Home Visitor presented new learning activities, optional kits, or optional activities to the parent, please answer the following questions:	
			1. Did the Home Visitor give a clear explanation of the rationale for the activity?	
			2. Did the Home Visitor give a clear explanation of the objectives of the learning activity?	
			3. Did the Home Visitor demonstrate the procedures?	
			4. Did the Home Visitor demonstrate the materials to be used in the learning activity to the parent?	
			5. Did the parent actually work with the materials in the role of teaching a child?	
			6. Did the parent demonstrate by comments or questions that she was involved in the learning activity?	
			7. Did the Home Visitor take enough time to clearly explain the learning activities to the parent?	

YES	NO	Not Applicable	CONTENT	COMMENTS
			Section 3. Information	
			1. Did the Home Visitor talk with the parent about how the child was doing in school?	
			2. Did the Home Visitor discuss with the parent how the child did on the last unit test?	
			3. Did the Home Visitor bring information about the Parent or PAC Meeting, or other school meetings to the parent?	
			4. Did the Home Visitor invite the parent to school?	
			5. Did the Home Visitor discuss the previous week's learning activities with the parent?	
			6. Did the Home Visitor plan her next visit with the parent?	
			7. Did the Home Visitor have any informal "community" discussions with the parent?	
			Section 4. Socialization Cues	
			1. How would you describe the relationship between the parent and the Home Visitor? (circle one) a. open hostility b. aloofness c. formal d. friendly e. warm, relaxed	
			2. Was the Home Visitor sensitive to the parent's needs and concerns? (Did the H.V. voice concern for the parent's needs?)	
			3. Was the Home Visitor responsive to the parent's needs and concerns? (Did the H.V. offer support or assistance?)	
			4. Did the Home Visitor verbally dominate the visit?	
			5. Did the parent verbally dominate the visit?	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

YES	NO	Not Applicable	CONTENT	COMMENTS
			Section 5. Assessment	
			1. How would you as an observer rate this Home Visit? _____ extremely successful _____ successful _____ moderately successful _____ weak but not totally unsuccessful _____ unsuccessful	
			2. How would you as an observer/interviewer rate the parent's understanding of the unit taught previously and followed up today? (check all that apply) _____ Parent expressed awareness of the Rationale _____ Parent expressed awareness of the specific Behavioral Objective (or task) (Have parent role play one activity) _____ Parent was able to demonstrate/discuss adequately the procedures she used to teach the child _____ Parent was able to demonstrate/discuss adequately the materials she used to teach the child	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOME VISITOR OBSERVATION SUMMARY FOR HOME VISITOR 7

HV EXPECTED	1 1.00	1 1.00
HV ON TIME	1 1.00	1 1.00
HAVE CHILD PROG INFO	1 1.00	1 1.00
HAVE UNIT TESTS	* ****	1 1.00
HAVE MATER.AND ACTIV	1 1.00	1 1.00
GIVE RATIONALE	1 1.00	1 1.00
EXPLAIN OBJECTIVES	1 1.00	1 1.00
DEMO PROCEDURES	1 1.00	1 1.00
DEMO MATERIALS	0 0.00	1 0.50
PARENT WORK IN TEACH ROL	0 0.00	1 0.50
PARENT DEMO INVOLVEMENT	1 1.00	1 1.00
HV TAKE TIME EXPLAIN	1 1.00	1 1.00
TALK PARENT ABOUT CHILD	1 1.00	1 1.00
DISCUSS UNIT TEST PARNT	* ****	1 1.00
BRING SCHOOL MEET. INFO	1 1.00	1 1.00
INVITE PARENT TO SCHOOL	1 1.00	1 1.00
DISCUSS PRIOR LEARN ACT.	1 1.00	1 1.00
PLAN VISIT WITH PARENT	1 1.00	1 1.00
COMMUNITY DISC WITH PRNT	1 1.00	1 1.00
DESCRIBE PARENT RELNSHIP	1 1.00	1 1.00
SENSITIVE TO PARENT NEED	1 1.00	1 1.00
RESPONSIVE PARENT NEED	1 1.00	1 1.00
HV VERB. DOMINATE CONV.	0 0.00	0 0.00
PARENT VERB. DOMINATE	0 0.00	0 0.00
OBSERVER RATING	1 1.00	1 1.00
PARENT AWARE RATIONALE	0 0.00	1 0.50
PARENT AWARE OBJECTIVE	1 1.00	1 1.00
PARENT ABLE DEMO PROCEDU	1 1.00	1 1.00
PARENT ABLE DEMO MATER	1 1.00	1 1.00

1 = positive
0 = negative

cumulative mean

Sample Home Visitor Observation Data

APPENDIX II

Teacher Observation Instrument

Observer_____

Teacher/Teaching Assistant_____

Number_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section I. Room Features

A. Learning Centers. Here is a list of learning centers. Please answer Questions 1, 2, and 3 below.

	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C
Math	_____	_____	_____
Science	_____	_____	_____
Language Arts	_____	_____	_____
Library	_____	_____	_____
Art	_____	_____	_____
Music	_____	_____	_____
Others _____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

1. Make a check mark (✓) in column A beside each Learning Center if there is a designated area in the classroom for that center.

2. Make a check mark (✓) in column B beside each Learning Center if that center is stocked with materials.

3. Make a check mark (✓) in column C beside each Learning Center that is used by a child while you are in the room.

YES	NO	Not Applicable	(Please check appropriate blocks.)	COMMENTS
☐	☐	☐	B. Are the bulletin boards prepared by children?	
☐	☐	☐	C. Are there examples of individual children's work displayed?	

YES	NO	Not Applicable	(Please check appropriate blocks.)	COMMENTS
			D. Are all necessary materials available to children?	
			E. Did you see any examples of child-initiated activities?	
			Section II. Transition	
			A. Did the teacher notify the class of an upcoming change?	
			B. Did the teacher provide instructions to the focus group?	
			C. Did the teacher provide instructions to the remaining group?	
			D. Did the teacher provide ample activities and materials for the remaining group?	
			Section III. Learning Activity - Teacher Behavior	
			A. How many children are in the focus group?_____	
			B. Did the teacher tell/show the children what they would be able to do when the learning activity was complete?	
			C. Did the teacher tell/show the children why the learning activity is important?	
			D. Did the teacher have all the materials ready and at hand?	
			E. Did the teacher model enthusiasm and interest?	
			F. Did the teacher provide for all children to be involved continuously, not sitting and waiting their turn?	
			G. After presenting each stimulus (question) to a child, did the teacher follow through with that child until closure?	
			H. Did the teacher find opportunity to positively reinforce each child?	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

YES	NO	Not Applicable	(Please check appropriate blocks.)	COMMENTS
			I. Did the teacher provide an opportunity for <u>each</u> child to respond to <u>each</u> task in the learning activity?	
			J. Did the teacher record (or make some kind of written record of) each child's performance?	
			K. How would you rate the total effect of this learning activity?	

_____ extremely successful
_____ successful
_____ moderately successful
_____ weak but not totally unsuccessful
_____ unsuccessful

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHER OBSERVATION SUMMARY FOR TEACHER 565

MATH CENTER DESIGNATED	1 1.0	1 1.00
MATH CENTER STOCKED	0 0.0	0 0.00
MATH CENTER USED	0 0.0	0 0.00
SCI CENTER DESIGNATED	1 1.0	1 1.00
SCI CENTER STOCKED	1 1.0	1 1.00
SCI CENTER USED	0 0.0	0 0.00
L-A CENTER DESIGNATED	1 1.0	1 1.00
L-A CENTER STOCKED	0 0.0	1 0.50
L-A CENTER USED	0 0.0	1 0.50
LIB CENTER STOCKED	1 1.0	1 1.00
LIB CENTER STOCKED	1 1.0	1 1.00
LIB CENTER USED	1 1.0	0 0.50
ART CENTER DESIGNATED	1 1.0	1 1.00
ART CENTER STOCKED	0 0.0	0 0.00
ART CENTER USED	0 0.0	1 0.50
MUS CENTER DESIGNATED	1 1.0	0 0.50
MUS CENTER STOCKED	0 0.0	0 0.00
MUS CENTER USED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER DESIGNATED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER STOCKED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER USED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER DESIGNATED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER STOCKED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER USED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER DESIGNATED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER STOCKED	0 0.0	0 0.00
OTHER CENTER USED	0 0.0	0 0.00
B-BOARDS AT CHILDREN	0 0.00	1 0.50
WORK EXAMPLES DISPLAYED	1 1.00	1 1.00
REC. MATERIAL AVAILABLE	1 1.0	1 1.00
CHILD INITIATED ACTIVITI	1 1.0	1 1.00
NOTIFY CLASS OF CHANGE	1 1.0	1 1.00
INSTRUCT FOCUS GROUP	1 1.00	1 1.00
INSTRUCT REMAINING GROUP	1 1.0	1 1.00
ACT-VAT REMAINING GROUP	1 1.0	1 1.00
#CHILDREN IN FOCUS GROUP	1 1.0	1 1.00
NOTIFY CHILD OBJECTIVES	1 1.0	1 1.00
RATIONALE	1 1.0	1 1.00
MATERIALS READY AT HAND	1 1.0	1 1.00
MODEL ENTHUSIASM	1 1.0	1 1.00
ALL CHILDREN INCLUDED	1 1.0	1 1.00
FOLLOW TO CLOSURE	1 1.0	1 1.00
POSITIVE REINFORCEMENT	1 1.0	1 1.00
EACH CHILD RESPOND	0 0.0	0 0.00
RECORD PERFORMANCE	1 1.0	1 1.00
TOTAL EFFECT RATING	1 1.0	1 1.00

1 = positive
0 = negative
cummulative mean

Sample Teacher Observation Data "Dummy Data"